





# TRACTS ON HOMŒOPATHY.

---

BY WILLIAM SHARP, M.D.,

Fellow of the Royal Society.

---

- 1.—What is Homœopathy?
  - 2.—The Defence of Homœopathy.
  - 3.—The Truth of Homœopathy.
  - 4.—The Small Dose of Homœopathy.
  - 5.—The Difficulties of Homœopathy.
  - 6.—The Advantages of Homœopathy.
  - 7.—The Principle of Homœopathy.
  - 8.—The Controversy on Homœopathy.
  - 9.—The Remedies of Homœopathy.
  - 10.—The Provings of Homœopathy.
  - 11.—The Single Medicine of Homœopathy.
  - 12.—The Common Sense of Homœopathy.
- 

LONDON:

AYLOTT AND CO., 8, PATERNOSTER ROW;

MANCHESTER: H. TURNER, 41, PICCADILLY;

NEW YORK: WILLIAM RADDE, 322, BROADWAY;

PHILADELPHIA: RADDEMACHER AND SHEEK.



## PREFACE.

---

PROFESSOR SIMPSON, of Edinburgh, considers the writings of HAHNEMANN a issue of "discreditable medical charlatanry." Dr. WILLIAMS, of London, exclaims, "Alas! what folly! and, I fear I may add, what knavery too!" As yet, the vast majority of the profession are of the same opinion.

Dr. DUDGEON writes thus of the *Organon* of HAHNEMANN:—"The immortal work that contains the full exposition of the principles of his doctrine, in their most perfect and matured state, needs not the recommendation of overstrained eulogy. *Perfect and complete in itself, it leaves no point of doctrine unexplained, no technical detail untouched, no adverse argument unanswered.*" Others agree with him in this estimate of the productions of their Master's pen.

For myself, I am not able to join either of these parties. Having tried Homœopathy practically, I cannot but admit, and contend for its claims; believing them to be superior to those of every other method of

treating diseases previously known. At the same time, I must acknowledge that, had I read HAHNEMANN'S works *before* making this practical trial, I never should have been induced to begin it. They are so filled with unproved assertions, illogical arguments, fanciful speculations, and obvious contradictions, as to render them, to me, exceedingly distasteful writings.

The results of my own independent examination of Homœopathy I have exhibited in these Essays, and I respectfully invite my professional brethren to give them their candid consideration. The reception they have already met with cannot but be encouraging to all who venture upon an honest acknowledgment of their convictions, and who hope in the final triumph of truth and soberness. The first Number was published on the 7th of June, 1852, the last on the 30th of December, 1854. The demand upon the printer has been for one hundred and thirty thousand copies of the separate tracts.

"All travail, and every right work" are sure to give rise to the exhibition of unworthy feelings. The first words I used showed what my expectations were with reference to my Allopathic colleagues; and I must now repeat them as my only reply to a variety of strictures which have proceeded from the Homœopathic ranks :—"Nihil tam honestum aut utile a Medico effici potest, quia, aliquando, ab invidis vituperari queat."

# Tracts on Homœopathy.—No. 1.

## WHAT IS HOMŒOPATHY?

BY WILLIAM SHARP, M.D., F.R.S.

Fifth Edition.

LONDON:  
AYLOTT AND CO., 8, PATERNOSTER ROW;  
MANCHESTER: H. TURNER, 41, PICCADILLY.  
NEW YORK: WILLIAM RADDE, 322, BROADWAY;  
PHILADELPHIA: RADDEMACHER AND SHEEK.

1854.

*Price Twopence.*

"I claim that liberty, which I willingly yield to others, the permission, namely, in subjects of difficulty, to put forward as true such things as appear to be probable, until proved to be manifestly false.'

WILLIAM HARVEY.



## WHAT IS HOMŒOPATHY?

---

“*NIHIL tam honestum aut utile a Medico effici potest quin, aliquando ab invidis vituperari queat.*”

GROENEVELT.

Nothing can be done by the Physician so honest or so useful  
as to escape the censure of the envious.

---

AMONG the many important “topics of the day,” none, having reference to this life only, can possess higher claims to calm enquiry and earnest attention than the various resources which are available to mankind, when suffering from bodily disease—a trial which few, if any, at all times escape.

In the present age of discovery and invention it would be remarkable if, while all around are sailing onward, the physician alone was becalmed; while every branch of art and science is progressively and rapidly improving, the resources of medicine remained stationary. But this has not happened, the onward wave has reached the healer’s barque, and he also is afloat upon the mighty waters of natural science.

There are indeed many who would stoutly stand upon the “old paths,” but in this case we have no inspired prophets and apostles, and as happily we have in an affair of higher moment, upon which their rest as upon a firm foundation. The *opinions* of mere men, however venerable by age, are but a sandy base. The people of the present times are not given to echo the sentiments of a master; Nature’s laws and nature’s facts alone are able to stand the rigorous scrutiny to which the sentiments of men, in physical science, are now so unreservedly exposed.

Some men’s minds, under such an apparently unsettled and disorderly state of things, become sceptical and faithless. This arises

from indolence; they will not give themselves the necessary trouble to investigate, and thus they throw truth and falsehood overboard together, and vainly try to rest upon a negative. But to the more active and industrious mind the same condition is stimulative to exertion. Truth is sought after with earnestness, and when found, is embraced with satisfaction and delight.

Among the medical enquiries of the day, Homœopathy, in the judgment of many, is the most important which has yet appeared, while in the opinion of many more it is “the biggest humbug that ever was!” It is proposed to consider, in a few words, what Homœopathy is not, and what it really is.

1. Homœopathy *is not a novelty*. In a Sanscrit poem called Sringāra Tilaka, written by Kālidāsa, who was one of the ornaments (or *gems* as they were commonly called,) of the court of Vikramāditya, king of Ujayin, whose reign, used as a chronological epoch by the Hindus, is placed about 56 years before the Christian Era, the following line occurs, which shews that the fact involving the principle of Homœopathy, had, in the East, even at that early period of time, passed into a proverb;—

“श्रुते हि पुरा लोके विषस्य विषमौषधं

“It has been heard of old time in the world that poison is the remedy for poison.”

HAHNEMANN observes that “the author of the book *περὶ τόπων τῶν κατ’ ἀνθρώπων*, which is among the writings attributed to HIPPOCRATES, has the following remarkable words:—*διὰ τὰ ὅμοια νοῦσος γίνεταί, καὶ διὰ τὰ ὅμοια προσφερόμενα ἐκ νοσεύντων ὑγιαίνονται, &c.\** “By similar things disease is produced, and by similar things, administered to the sick, they are healed of their diseases. Thus the same thing which will produce a strangury, when it does not exist, will remove it when it does.”

These sentiments are thus expressed by Cornarius in his translation, in 1564.—“*Per similia morbus fit, et per similia adhibita ex morbo sanantur. Velut urinæ stilicidium idem facit si non sit, et idem sedat.*” †

The learned Dr. FRANCIS ADAMS, in his Translation of the works of Hippocrates, published in 1849, by the Sydenham Society, thus comments upon this passage:—“The treatment of suicidal mania appears singular,—‘Give the patient a draught made from the root of mandrake, in a smaller dose than will induce mania. . . He then insists, in strong terms, that, under certain

\* Organon, translated by Dudgeon, p. 106.

† Hippocratis Opera Juno Cornario interprete, 1564, pp. 87 88.

circumstances, purgatives will bind the bowels, and astringents loosen them. And he further makes the important remark that, although the general rule of treatment be ‘*contraria contrariis curantur*,’ the opposite rule also holds good in some cases, namely, ‘*similia similibus curantur*.’ It thus appears that the principles both of *Allopathy* and *Homœopathy* are recognized by the author of this treatise. In confirmation of the latter principle he remarks that the same substance which occasions strangury will also sometimes cure it, and so also with cough. And further, he acutely remarks, that warm water, which, when drunk, generally excites vomiting, will also sometimes put a stop to it by removing its cause.”\*

HAHNEMANN further observes that “later physicians have also felt and expressed the truth of the homœopathic method of cure.” As for instance, BOULDUC, DETHARDING, BERTHOLON, THOURY, VON STÖRCK, and especially STAHL,—all these during the eighteenth century. But their observations were slightly made, and produced no permanent impression, either on their own minds or on those of others. We are indebted to HAHNEMANN for the full discovery and development of the law, and for forcing it with sufficient perseverance upon the attention of the world.

I have been asked if SHAKSPEARE makes any allusion to this method of cure. We have one in the following passage:—

“In poison there is physie; and these news,  
Having been well, that would have made me sick,  
Being sick, have in some measure made me well.”

HENRY IV., Part 2, Act 1, Sce. 1.

2. *Homœopathy is not quackery.* The essence of quackery is secrecy. The individual practising it pretends to the possession of some valuable remedy—a nostrum—which he sells for his own private gain, but which he will not disclose for the public good. Homœopathy has no secrets—no nostrum—it courts enquiry, it entreats medical men to investigate it. This is not quackery.

Homœopathy, in its present form, was discovered by a regular physician, (HAHNEMANN,) and was first published in the leading medical journal of Europe, (HUFELAND’S,) in 1796. It has been studied and adopted by several thousands of regularly educated and qualified practitioners, some of them Professors in Universities, and others leading men in their profession, who urgently call upon their colleagues to follow their example. They offer every facility in the way of instruction, by hospitals and dispensaries, and by private information which it is in their power to give. This is not quackery,

Homœopathy is no field for the St. John Longs and the Morissons—the patent medicine vendors. The unsettled, unsatisfactory.

\* Works of Hippocrates, translated by Francois Adams, LL.D., Sydenham Society,—1849. Vol. i. page 77.



and unsuccessful course of the educated physician leads his patients to try quacks and quackery, whose means, it must be acknowledged, are very similar to his own, and sometimes more successful. Nothing would so effectually drive away all real charlatanry as the adoption, by the profession, of a recognized law of healing, and the carrying this out fully and fairly, so as to derive from it all the success which can in reason be looked for.

3. *Homœopathy is not globulism.* Globules are a particular mode of preparing medicinal doses, invented by HAHNEMANN and recommended by him; but Homœopathy is in no way dependent upon their reception for its successful practice. The association is accidental, and is simply a matter of convenience.

4. *Homœopathy is not an uncertainty.* It is surprising how the opponents of Homœopathy, and even some of its friends, bewilder both themselves and others, when they endeavour to explain what Homœopathy is. The impression is thus produced that the new doctrine is nothing more than a wild theory, very vague, and very worthless. The most common mistake is thus stated:—"A medicine, or a poison, which will produce a disease will cure it." "If I am fatigued with a long walk I must take a short one!" This is the same curing the same—not *like curing like*. Similis is not idem. The remark about being fatigued was made by an eminent Greek scholar, but Greek scholars ought not to fall into such an error as to confound ὁμός with ὁμοιος; they may be reminded of the controversy between Athanasius and Arius, in the fourth century, and the difference between ὁμοούσιος and ὁμοιούσιος.

Let me try to set this matter in a clear light. "Give," says HIPPOCRATES, in a particular case of insanity, "a draught from the root of mandrake, in a smaller dose than will induce mania," that is, if taken in health. In both cases there is an alienation of mind, the symptoms are similar, but the causes are different, and the cases are not identical.

The preparation of mercury called corrosive sublimate is one of the most violent poisons; two or three grains are sufficient to destroy life, as has happened when it has been given by mistake for calomel. The symptoms it produces are well known to be those of inflammation of the stomach and bowels, accompanied by diarrhœa with bloody stools;—in the words of TAYLOR,\* symptoms "like those of dysentery,—tenesmus and mucous discharges mixed with blood, being very frequently observed." In March, 1852, I saw J. C., a tall spare man, about thirty, suffering from a severe attack of dysentery;—his countenance much distressed, a great many stools for three days consisting of blood and jelly-like mucus, with considerable pain in the abdomen increased by pressure, and a quick pulse. I dissolved one grain of corrosive sublimate in half-an-ounce of water, put four drops of this solution into two drams of dilute

\* Medical Jurisprudence. Article Corr. Subl.

alcohol, and gave him six drops of this tincture in four ounces of water, directing him to take a dessert spoonful every three hours till the symptoms abated. He immediately improved, had no other treatment, and in three days he was quite well. Here the symptoms of the dysentery were like those which this preparation of mercury produces, but they had not been occasioned by corrosive sublimate, *therefore* it was a proper remedy on the principle of *similia*,—that like is to be treated with like.

Every one knows that the Spanish fly, cantharides, even when only applied externally in the form of a blister, very often acts injuriously upon the bladder, causing strangury and other painful symptoms connected with that organ. I hold in my hand a little book with the following title—"Tutus Cantharidum in Medicinâ Usus Internus, per Joannem Groenevelt, M.D., e Coll. Med. Lond. Editio Secunda. 1703." This book is full of interesting cases of strangury and other affections of the bladder very successfully treated by the internal use of cantharides. Here is a special case of Homœopathy,—of like curing like—or in the words of the old translator of Hippocrates already quoted, "*Velut urinæ stillicidium idem facit si non sit, et si sit idem sedat.*" The drug produces the complaint *if not there*, but *if it be there*, (arising from another cause), it cures it. For this method of treatment, the author tells us in his preface *he was committed to Newgate*, on the warrant of the President of his own College—The Royal College of Physicians of London—"Chartâ quâdam manibus propriis signatâ, sigilloque firmatâ me sceleratorum carceri (*Newgate* vulgo dicto,) malæ praxeos reum asseverantes, tradiderunt !" This happened in 1694—just a century before HAHNEMANN. It is worthy of remark, before quitting Dr. GREENFIELD, that the dose of cantharides which he gave was such as to oblige him to give camphor along with it, as an antidote to correct the otherwise aggravating effect of the fly. The present method of reducing the dose, which we owe to HAHNEMANN, has enabled me to cure similar cases of diseased bladder without the addition of the camphor, and without fear of aggravating the symptoms.

One instance more. Belladonna, when swallowed as a poison, produces a scarlet rash, a sore throat, fever, headache, &c., all which symptoms appear in scarlet fever. Belladonna, as was first discovered by HAHNEMANN, not only generally cures, but often preserves from scarlet fever. *Belladonna does not produce or cause scarlet fever, but it does produce symptoms similar to those of scarlet fever.* Whoever will carefully study these examples will no longer charge the doctrine of Homœopathy with vagueness and uncertainty.

5. Homœopathy is not an infinitesimal dose. This is another popular mistake, diligently, though perhaps ignorantly, fostered by the opponents of Homœopathy. Like curing like—*similia simili-*



bus curantur—says nothing about the dose. All that is essential to the carrying out of this principle—all that the general fact or law of nature requires for its fulfilment is announced by HIPPOCRATES; give the poison in a *smaller dose* as a remedy in the natural disease, than would be sufficient to produce similar symptoms in a healthy person. A smaller dose—how much smaller is a matter of experience. If twenty grains of ipecacuanha will make a healthy person sick, the twentieth part of a grain may be required to cure a similar sickness. If twenty grains of rhubarb will act as a purgative, one grain may cure a similar diarrhæa. If two grains of arsenic or corrosive sublimate might bring on fatal inflammation of the stomach or bowels, the thousandth, or the ten-thousandth part of a grain may be sufficient to cure—not that inflammation brought on by itself,—but a similar inflammation arising from other causes.

It should not be forgotten that Homœopathy, as a principle, was discovered by experiments made with ordinary doses, and a man may be a true Homœopathist though he never prescribe any other. The nature and effect of the so called infinitesimal doses, are separate questions; those who make use of them find that they are (from whatever cause) efficacious, and generally sufficient, but no man is pledged to use them exclusively, though many do, being satisfied from their experience that they are the safest and best mode of administering medicine. No one will deny that they are the pleasantest, and if success follow their use, why should they not be used? Because, it is said, they appear absurd, and their action cannot be explained. But if a fraction of a grain will cure a disease is it not more absurd to give a poisonous dose? And who can explain the mode of action of the large dose any more than of the small one? If diseases disappear of themselves under suitable diet and regimen, or if the small doses afford all the aid required, why should patients be “encumbered with assistance,” or their recovery be retarded or jeopardised by the unwieldy and often injurious interference of large doses of poisonous drugs? Why has it so often been said that “the remedy proved worse than the disease?”

6. Homœopathy is not a “humbug.” Neither are those who profess it “knaves or fools, swindlers or donkeys.” Were the matter a piece of deceit, it is not likely to have had the steady success which its opponents are constrained to acknowledge attends its practice. A short time, at any rate, would expose its fallacy. An ingenious and plausible advocate might make an *hypothesis* popular, but he could never obtain extensive belief in the statement of a supposed *fact* which every day’s observation proved to be untrue. As to the hard names, they are no arguments, and therefore must remain unanswered, except by the observation that they generally betray a weak cause on the side of those who use them. Men conscious of integrity can afford to despise them. We are forbidden,

and feel no inclination to return railing for railing ; what we wish is that our medical brethren would study our science, and instead of abusing *us*, help us to improve *it*, for the benefit of our own and future generations. When any one speaks disrespectfully of things of which he is ignorant, he may be very fitly rebuked, as Dr. HALLEY was by Sir ISAAC NEWTON:—" *I have studied these things—you have not.*"

7. HOMŒOPATHY IS A GENERAL FACT,—a *principle*,—a *law of nature*.—All nature is exquisitely arranged and governed by perfect laws,—the result of infinite wisdom and almighty power. The discovery of these general facts has marked epochs in the annals of mankind. What consequences have followed the discovery that a magnetized steel bar, when free to move horizontally, always turns one of its extremities towards the north pole of the earth, as is seen in the mariner's compass? And what will follow from the further fact, so recently discovered by ŒERSTED, that when this bar is surrounded by a current of electricity, its direction is altered, at will, to the right hand or to the left, as is seen in the electric telegraph? Who attempts to *explain* or to *ridicule* these things? They are FACTS. NEWTON discovered that the force of gravity is in direct proportion to the mass of matter in the attracting bodies and in inverse proportion to the square of their distances. Doubtless many other proportions are *possible*, but this is the one fixed upon by the wisdom of the Great GOD. DALTON discovered that the elements of matter, when combining chemically with each other, always do so in certain fixed proportions;—for example, oxygen combines with hydrogen in the proportion of eight parts by weight to one; this is an interesting particular fact, but it becomes much more important when it is known to be a general fact, that oxygen will combine in the same proportion of eight parts by weight with a fixed weight of every other element; as with six of carbon, sixteen of sulphur, fifteen of phosphorus, thirty-five of chlorine, twenty-seven of iron, thirty-one of copper, &c., and these likewise with each other in the same proportions in which they combine with oxygen; as thirty-five of chlorine with one of hydrogen, twenty-seven of iron, thirty-one of copper, &c. &c. Here is a law of nature, absolutely unalterable by us, and yet it is most evident that these proportions of combinations *might* have been very different;—they are so arranged by infinite wisdom—we cannot explain why—*shall we ridicule the arrangement?* So we can imagine many laws of healing, but our business is to discover, if possible, the actual one. The evidence in favour of *similia similibus eurantur* is already great, and is increasing daily. It claims to be received as a *general fact* unless it can be set aside by good evidence to the contrary. Let it be borne in mind that ordinary medicine is without a rule, and even, as contended for by the



present President of the Royal College of Physicians, "incapable" of receiving one. It is, consequently, in the condition of ships before the discovery of the mariner's compass. If then a rule be found, how great must be its value! It is not possible to over-rate the value of a well-founded principle in any branch of science, for "principles built upon the unerring foundation of observations and experiments, must necessarily stand good, till the dissolution of nature itself."\*

8. *Homœopathy is a practical fact.* It is not a speculative theory to be reasoned upon in the closet, but a fact to be observed at the bedside; it is no metaphysical subject, to be logically shown by *à priori* reasoning to be absurd; it is no piece of presumption and impudence to be put down—"by authority," as the council of our Royal College of Surgeons happily acknowledges; it is a fact to be examined, like the statement of any other fact, *upon evidence*. We are not called upon to sit down and imagine its possibility, or its impossibility, but we are urgently pressed to observe whether it be true or not. Hundreds of credible witnesses tell us that all curable diseases are, for the most part, readily cured by the new method. This is asserted as a fact. Is it true? This is the question. Try the medicines—Why should you not? The interests of humanity require it. If they succeed, it is a great blessing; if they fail, publish the failures. This is the only fair and honest way to oppose Homœopathy, and in no other way is it likely to be opposed with success.

9. *Homœopathy stands upon its comparative merits.* This must be the test of all methods of treating disease. There is no absolute preservation from suffering in a sinful world, nor any deliverance from death. "There is no discharge in that war." And as all generations have died under the old method, so, should the new one prevail, all generations will continue to die under it. This consideration should render disputants on both sides soberminded. Medical men are engaged in an unequal contest; the great enemy will always conquer at last; but the question is a fair and a rational one, from which class of means do we actually obtain the greatest amount of relief from bodily suffering, and by which is the apparent approach of death most frequently warded off? This reduces the whole matter to what would seem to be its proper shape—a practical question—What will do me most good when I am ill?

10. *The old method is unsatisfactory.* This is admitted by almost all medical authorities. It is not necessary to bring forward quotations in support of this statement; they might be had in abundance, but the fact is so notorious that the differing of doctors has become a proverb; in short, there is no opposition of sentiment, or of practice, too great not to be frequently met

\* Emerson, in Newton's *Principia*, vol. 3, p. 86.



with. I well remember the reply made to me by an eminent and old practitioner when I was a pupil—who saw the distress I was in on perceiving the uncertain condition of medical knowledge—"If there be nothing true in medicine, there is in surgery, so you must give your mind to *that*!" The old medicine is in the condition that astronomy was in before NEWTON, and in a worse condition than chemistry was in before DALTON; many valuable isolated facts known, but no golden thread, no law of nature discovered, by which a host of conflicting conjectures might be dissipated, and facts reduced to an intelligible order.

11. *Homœopathy is simple and intelligible.* However absurd the rule may appear to some, it is practically, a plain one, and becomes to those who follow it, more easy and more satisfactory, every day. It is not pretended that it can be carried out without serious labour. The law of gravity is abundantly plain and simple, but there are plenty of difficulties, notwithstanding, in working out the inequalities of the moon's motions.

12. *Homœopathy gains by comparison.* It is more successful than the old system. This comparison can be instituted in two ways—by the statistics of public institutions, and by those converts from the old practice who have tried it long enough to be able to compare with each other the results, in their own hands, of the two methods. As an illustration of the former mode of comparison, the following abstract drawn from Dr. Routh's statistics, (in the "*Fallacies of Homœopathy*,") may be given;—

| HOMŒOPATHIC TREATMENT. |                  | ALLOPATHIC TREATMENT. |                  |
|------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|------------------|
|                        | Deaths per cent. |                       | Deaths per cent. |
| Pneumonia . . . . .    | 5.7              | . . . . .             | 24.              |
| Pleuritis . . . . .    | 3.               | . . . . .             | 13.              |
| Peritonitis . . . . .  | 4.               | . . . . .             | 13.              |
| Dysentery . . . . .    | 3.               | . . . . .             | 22.              |
| All Diseases . . . . . | 4.4              | . . . . .             | 10.5             |

When, in 1836, the Asiatic Cholera attacked, as an awful scourge, the city of Vienna, all the hospitals were fitted up to receive cases indiscriminately, as they occurred; one was a Homœopathic hospital, but under the inspection of two Allopathic physicians. The authorized report, when the epidemic had done its work of death, was this;—

|                                 |                                  |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Mortality in the Hom. Hospital. | Mortality in the Allo. Hospital. |
| 33 per cent.                    | 66 per cent.                     |

Two-thirds recovered in the one, and two-thirds died in the other.\*

When, in 1849, Edinburgh was visited with this pestilence, there was a general mortality of one-half of those attacked, and the

\* See the well-known book, *Austria and its Institutions*, by Mr. W. R. Wilde, M.R.I.A.

proportion of recoveries under Homœopathic treatment was three-fourths. The entire returns were ;—

|                                 |                    |       |
|---------------------------------|--------------------|-------|
| Cases.                          | Cured.             | Died. |
| 817                             | 271                | 546   |
| Those treated Homœopathically.  |                    |       |
| Cases.                          | Cured.             | Died. |
| 236                             | 179                | 57    |
| Mortality under Hom. Treatment. | General Mortality. |       |
| 25 per cent.                    | 66 per cent.       |       |

When, in the same year, Liverpool was attacked, 5,098 deaths took place between May 20th and October 6th :—

|                                 |                    |
|---------------------------------|--------------------|
| Mortality under Hom. Treatment. | General Mortality. |
| 25 per cent.                    | 46 per cent.       |

It will be understood that if the cases treated by the new method had been deducted from the entire cases in Edinburgh and Liverpool, the per centage of deaths under allopathy would have been greater than that stated as the general mortality.

When, in 1853, the Cholera broke out with alarming suddenness, and with more than its usual virulence, in Newcastle the mortality during September and the early part of October reached 1,500. DR. HAYLE has kindly informed me that he and MR. ELLIOT treated, during these few weeks, 81 cases of Cholera and lost 16, being a mortality of 20 per cent or one-fifth, while it is believed that the general mortality considerably exceeded 50 per cent, or more than one half of the persons attacked. A large number of deaths took place from Diarrhæa. DR. HAYLE and MR. ELLIOT treated 280 cases of Diarrhæa without one death. The Royal College of Physicians has repeatedly stated that it is in *this* stage of Cholera that treatment is successful, and that if it be neglected the case often terminates fatally. *If these 280 cases had no efficient treatment, how is it that they all recovered?*

The second mode of comparison rests in the bosom of each private practitioner. Thus much however may be stated, so far as I am at present informed, every practitioner who has, with sufficient care and perseverance, studied Homœopathy, has embraced it; and I have not yet heard of one who has deserted its ranks because he has been disappointed as to the efficacy and superiority of this mode of treatment. For myself, I may be permitted to say that, having practiced the old method for many years with success, and having now devoted myself for some time to the new mode, while I at once acknowledge that the study is laborious and not without its difficulties, I am persuaded that it is a change for the better, and I venture to engage that if my medical brethren will try such plants as the following, prepared as

we now use them, in the cases for which they are indicated by the law of similia, they will be greatly surprised and gratified by their beneficial effects ;—

Aconitum Napellus,  
Bryonia Alba,  
Matricaria Chamomilla,  
Ipecacuanha,

Atropa Belladonna,  
Arnica Montana,  
Pulsatilla Pratensis,  
Nux Vomica, &c., &c.

13. *Homœopathy is medical treatment.* It is not the do-nothing system which it is represented to be by opponents who thus only betray their ignorance. When fever and dysentery were desolating many parts of Ireland in 1847, one of the places which suffered most was Bantry, near Skibbereen, in the county of Cork. During ten weeks one hundred and ninety-two cases were treated homœopathically by MR. KIDD, at their own homes, amid all the wretchedness of famine; the mortality from fever was less than two per cent., and from dysentery fourteen per cent. During the same period many were treated on the old method in the Bantry Union Hospital, with the advantages of proper ventilation, attendance, nourishment, &c., and from the report of DR. ABRAHAM TUCKEY, the physician, the mortality from fever was more than thirteen per cent., and from dysentery thirty-six per cent.

At the same time another Fever Hospital was opened for similar cases occurring among the emigrants from Ireland to this country, in which the medical man tells us he abstained from all interference, and remained passively watching the cases, ordering them free ventilation, cleanliness and confinement to bed; water, or milk and water, being given as drinks. He congratulates himself upon the success attendant upon thus allowing the cases to take their natural course, undisturbed by medicine; the deaths from fever in this hospital were ten per cent. We have here, therefore, an opportunity of comparing together the results of the three methods;—the ordinary system of medicine, no medicine at all, and the homœopathic medicine. The deaths from fever are thus reported:—under ordinary medicine, above thirteen per cent.—under no medicine at all, ten per cent.—under homœopathic medicine less than two per cent.; a sufficient proof that *that* is doing something and gaining by it; while by the same comparison, giving large doses of medicines is doing something indeed, but losing by it.

14. *Homœopathy is a practical guide.* It is not like Hydro-pathy, a single remedy to be applied in the treatment of every disease; it is a guide or rule to direct us in the use of all remedies. The medical practitioner who, for years, has felt and mourned over the bewildered condition of his professional knowledge,—the contradictions of his theories, and the uncertainty of his facts, is the only person who can fully appreciate the value of any principle capable of affording him a light to guide his path. Few intelligent persons



however, can have failed to discover, from their intercourse with physicians, that ordinary medicine is in an unsettled and benighted condition. It has many valuable facts, it has many excellent remedies ; but the facts are isolated, or connected only by false hypotheses, and the remedies are made use of in such a vague manner, and in such destructive doses, that the value of the one, and the excellence of the other, are either greatly impaired or converted into injuries.

15. Homœopathy *is a guide in the choice of the medicine, not of the dose.* The dose is, as yet, a question of experience. The law of similia is an admirable guide in the selection of an appropriate remedy in any case of disease ; but the only information it affords in the choice of the dose is this, that it must be a *smaller* one than would be sufficient to produce similar symptoms in health. *How small* a dose this is, must be ascertained by trial, until some general fact or law can happily be discovered, which shall constitute a guide to the dose, as the law of similia does to the medicine. I venture to entertain a sanguine hope that this will be accomplished.

16. Homœopathy *aims at eradicating, or permanently curing the disease*, wherever this is possible, not merely at affording palliative relief. This constitutes another great feature of the new method, and again points out, in a striking manner, its superiority over the old mode. If the symptoms of an ailment are cured by the operation of the remedy upon the constitution, the cause of those symptoms, or the pathological condition, is, in all probability, permanently removed. In seeking to effect this, no other mischief is occasioned. How often has not this case occurred,—a patient is suffering from cough, medicines called expectorants are prescribed ; at the next visit the cough is somewhat relieved, but the expectorants have unfortunately produced nausea, and the appetite is gone ; mineral acids are ordered to improve the tone of the stomach, and to restore appetite ; at the following visit, the appetite is better, but the acid has irritated the mucous membrane of the bowels, and has produced diarrhœa ; to check this, astringents must be given, which have occasioned, by the time of the next visit, a return or aggravation of the cough, and thus the round has to be re-commenced. Who does not see that there is room for improvement in such a system ? But the greatest of all difficulties of the old mode of treatment is this,—to decide the point whether depleting and lowering measures, antiphlogistics, as they are called, are indicated, or the opposite remedies, stimulants and tonics. The most eminent and experienced practitioners not unfrequently differ in their opinions upon this important point, even when, humanly speaking, the life of the patient hangs upon the decision. Now this acknowledged and grave difficulty is greatly mitigated, if not entirely removed, under the new method ; the group of symptoms has to be taken, and a similar group found, belonging to any

remedy; *that* is the remedy most likely to be useful, by whatever name it has been usual to designate it.

17. Homœopathy *economises the vital powers*. It does not, like bleeding, and purging, and salivating, and sweating, draw largely upon the remaining strength of the patient, already perhaps greatly reduced by his sufferings. Homœopathy lets well alone. Its medicines act only upon the diseased organ. If the head be sick, it does not add to this sickness, a complaint in the intestines, which strong purgatives must do; if the lungs be inflamed, it does not also bring on an inflammation in the skin, which a blister does. The beneficial consequence of this method is conspicuous in the speedy return of the patient to his accustomed health and occupation. When the acute disease is removed, which it often is in an unusually short space of time, the patient is well; he has no tedious convalescence, requiring wine and bark.

18. Homœopathy *is gentle and agreeable*. If the new mode of treatment be found, on trial, to be *only as efficacious* as the old one, it ought to be preferred on account of its gentleness and pleasantness; how much more if it succeed *better*. The action of the medicines, in point of fact, is found to be such as to supersede the necessity for the severe measures and nauseous doses hitherto had recourse to. The medicines are tasteless, or nearly so, themselves, and they do not need the aid of such formidable adjuncts as bleeding, and blistering, and setons, and issues, and cauterisations, and moxas. Already, indeed, the beneficial influence of Homœopathy in this respect, upon general practice, has been greatly felt. In the year 1827, I attended the military hospital in Paris, which was in charge of BARON LARREY, Senior Surgeon to the Army of Napoleon. At every morning's visit, he had, among his numerous attendants, two "internes" or, as they are called at the London Hospitals, dressers, accoutred in this manner;—one carried a small chafing dish with fire in it, and the other, a box containing a number of actual cauteries, (irons like small pokers,)\* and a pair of bellows. As we passed from bed to bed, one or more of the suffering occupants were sure to be ordered the cautery, when one of the irons was immediately placed in the chafing dish, the bellows were applied, and as soon as the instrument was brilliantly red hot, the Baron would take it in his hand, and deliberately draw two or three lines on the flesh of the patient, very like the broad arrow with which most of us are familiar, made by the ordnance surveyors, on our houses and pavements during their late labours in all parts of the country. Now, surely, to see banished for ever, not only such painful methods as this, but every thing which approaches to it, must be a consummation to be wished for.

19. Homœopathy *administers one medicine at a time*. This is another great improvement. How was it possible ever to attain to

\* See a representation of these in Tract, No. 6, page 11.



satisfactory knowledge of the powers and properties of any drug, so long as several were always combined together when given to a patient? In the days of SYDENHAM, the father of English medicine, sixty or eighty medicines were mixed together in the favourite prescriptions; this number has been greatly reduced since the time of SYDENHAM, but, so long as two medicines are given together, it is impossible to ascertain with accuracy the effects of either.

20. The Homœopathic Physician *learns the properties of drugs by experiments upon himself, not upon his patients.* That the contrary has been the plan hitherto adopted is notorious. How many poor people have been deterred from availing themselves of the aid of our hospitals, lest they should have “experiences” tried upon them!

The only certain way of learning the real effects of drugs upon man’s health is to administer them experimentally to *healthy* persons. None have thought of this method, so far as appears, except the illustrious HALLER and HAHNEMANN;—none have attempted to carry it out except HAHNEMANN and his disciples.

It is evident that the properties of medicinal substances must be ascertained by some kind of experiment; the question in dispute is this, is it best to try these experiments upon sick persons, or upon healthy ones? Shall the physician get his knowledge by experimenting *upon his patients, or upon himself?* The practitioners of the old school pursue the former method, those of the new one the latter. What does the *patient* say?

21. Homœopathy *is applicable to acute, as well as to chronic diseases.* When the discovery was first announced to the world by HAHNEMANN, he did not carry its application further than to chronic diseases,—to ailments continuing for a long time. And the impression is still general that such treatment may possibly avail where there is abundance of *time*, but what is to be done in cases of emergency? Acute disease with immediate danger,—how can you trust to Homœopathy *then?* The answer to this grave question, which manifold experience gives, as indeed may be partly gathered from the statistics of Cholera and other acute diseases, given in the preceding pages, is this, that it is able to grapple with the most dangerous and sudden attacks of disease, *more successfully than any other known method of treatment.*

22. Homœopathy *is prepared for any new form of disease* far better than the old method. This fact was very strikingly exhibited on the appearance of Asiatic Cholera in Europe. The various Colleges of Physicians were quite at a loss to know how to deal with the formidable stranger; and when called upon, in their respective countries, to issue advice and directions, nothing could be more painful than the visible inconsistencies and unsatisfactoriness of their multiform recommendations.

On the other hand, the Homœopathic practitioners, whether in

Russia or in Austria, in France or in England, found the true remedies without co-operation and without difficulty, and they proved wonderfully successful. HAHNEMANN himself published a tract pointing out the proper treatment, from the description he had read of the disease before he had seen a case.

This point was with SYDENHAM a great source of perplexity. "This at least," says he, "I am convinced of; viz., that epidemic diseases differ from one another like north and south, and that the remedy which would cure a patient at the beginning of a year, will kill him, perhaps, at the close. Again, that when once by good fortune, I have hit upon the true and proper line of practice that this or that fever requires, I can, (with the assistance of the Almighty,) by taking my aim in the same direction, generally succeed in my results. This lasts until the first form of epidemic becomes extinct, and until a fresh one sets in. *Then I am again in a quandary*, and am puzzled to think how I can give relief. . . .

. . . It is more than I can do to avoid risking the lives of one or two of the first who apply to me as patients." \* This is the confession of a man entitled, for his truthfulness and genius, to the highest admiration. The difficulty, though not perhaps always so frankly acknowledged, has been always felt until now;—it is *not* a difficulty in Homœopathy.

23. Homœopathy *carries into detail what all medicine is in the general*. Medicines are not food, but poisons;—not materials which of themselves can preserve or produce health. They are all naturally inimical to the human body, but when that body is in a state of disease, they are found, as a matter of experience, sometimes to assist in restoring it to health.

Medicine *in the general*, is poison to the healthy frame of man, and a remedy to that frame when sick; this is admitted by all, and this is Homœopathy in the general; why not then have Homœopathy in detail? Why not first ascertain what symptoms each poison produces, when taken in health? and why not give it as a remedy for similar symptoms in natural disease? Medical men have been experimenting in the treatment of disease for many centuries, why not try *this* experiment? Our opponents admit, in general, what they ridicule, and oppose, when carried out, in particulars.†

24. Finally, Homœopathy *relates only to the administration of remedies*, and detracts nothing from the value of the collateral branches of the science of medicine. It leaves Anatomy, Physiology, Chemistry, &c., unaffected. The Homœopathic Physician ought to be as accomplished in these, and other departments of knowledge, as his fellow practitioner of the old school; and he is

\* Works of Sydenham, Vol. i. p. 33. Sydenham Society's Edition.

† This subject is finely touched upon in "The Human Body," by Dr. J. J. G. Wilkinson.

more likely than the other to turn all such knowledge to the beneficial account of his patient.

This is a brief exposition of the leading features of Homœopathy. They would admit of being much more copiously enlarged upon, but the aim has been to make a few points so clear that it may not be doubtful what we are contending for. We should be glad to be fairly met with facts and arguments, but in the place of these we have ridicule and abuse. In time, perhaps, the tables will turn, and then, no doubt, *Punch* will find it much more easy to satirise the face contorted at the sight of the "black draught" about to be swallowed, or the barber's pole and bandage for bleeding, than he has hitherto done any of the facts belonging to Homœopathy.

But surely any proposal, such as is explained in the foregoing pages, even if there be but a chance that it may be instrumental in diminishing the sufferings of our fellow men, deserves to be received with something more decorous than ridicule. "Those who reject it, or who cast it out of the way, as unworthy of enquiry, must do so on their own responsibility." If they decline "to search all things that may present even the shadow of a chance of bringing them more nearly acquainted with the laws which the Creator has instituted for the government of the world, and especially with those upon which He has caused the preservation of health to depend, let them recognise that it will be vain for them, in any after hour of hopelessness, when it may be too late to avert their own premature death, or the death of a relative or friend, to rely on the hacknied consolation, that the calamity is to be regarded as a new instance of the inscrutable ways of Providence, and not as the penalty of having wilfully blinded themselves to any light beneficently set before them, the reception of which might have ensured their preservation." \*

\* "Truths and their reception," by M. B. Sampson, p. 97.

*Rugby, May 5, 1854.*





